PERFORMANCE & IMPACT EVALUATION (P&IE)

MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: SCHOOL HEALTH AND READING PROGRAM (SHRP)

30 APRIL 2014

PERFORMANCE & IMPACT EVALUATION (P&IE)

MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: SCHOOL HEALTH AND READING PROGRAM (SHRP)

30 April 2014

PN 7384; USAID Contract N0: AID-617-C-12-00006

PRESENTED TO:

USAID/Uganda

Joseph Mwangi

PRESENTED BY:

NORC at the University of Chicago

Jeffrey Telgarsky

Executive Vice President for Research

4350 East-West Highway, 8th Floor

Bethesda, MD 20814

Telephone: (301) 634-9413

Fax: (301) 634-9301

DISCLAIMER

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document sets out the implementation plan for carrying out a Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of the Uganda School Health and Reading Program (SHRP), a five-year USAID-funded cooperative agreement implemented by RTI International. The overall objective of SHRP is to increase literacy and health-seeking behaviors, with two key results: improved early grade reading and transition to English, and improved HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices.

The purpose of the P&IE contract is to evaluate SHRP program implementation and effectiveness, and the extent to which the program's literacy and HIV/AIDS prevention activities result in measurable impact at the level of student learning. NORC leads overall contract implementation, impact evaluation, and dissemination workshops; and the Panagora Group leads ongoing performance monitoring and feedback to the RTI program team, performance evaluation, and supports dissemination workshops.

Through these activities, in particular the third party monitoring and performance feedback, the P&IE team has acquired a high level of familiarity with SHRP and achieved an effective and well received way to provide performance feedback to its senior staff, while maintaining objectivity and independence. In our P&IE work, we continuously review implementation documents and performance and therefore are able to carry out the Mid-Term Evaluation in an efficient manner, per our detailed timeline below, which includes data collection at the national, district, and school levels.

The SHRP Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of SHRP will assess the effectiveness of activities to date using both qualitative and quantitative data and identify progress in achieving its planned five-year results against RTI's planned achievements for this stage of the work. As a mid-term evaluation, it will also provide recommendations to maintain or improve progress in achieving results. This will be a cross-sectional descriptive and analytical performance evaluation employing qualitative methods of data collection. We will look at the program's inputs, processes and outputs. Though the evaluation will employ mainly qualitative methods of data collection, we will gather quantitative data through review of documents. The data collection methodologies to be utilized include; a) desk review; b) key informant interviews (KIIs); classroom observation; and focus group discussions (FGDs). We explain our approach in detail, and include data collection instruments for key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and classroom observations in Annex A, and an initial list of contacts in Annex B.

Our Mid-Term Performance Evaluation questions are:

- *Design.* Does the project design and structure adequately support and facilitate achievement of the desired results?

- *Implementation.* Is SHRP being implemented according to plan? Is the program on track to achieving its overall objectives and results? Are the systems and mechanism for documenting lessons learned and best practices effective?

- *Impact.* What are the key factors for differences in performance (reading skills acquisition and HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills) in schools receiving the same interventions?

- *Sustainability.* To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance?

- *Cost-effectiveness*. What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions? In what ways can the programs be more cost effective?

- *Management/Coordination/Lessons Learned*. How can program design, management and execution become more efficient toward achieving program goals?

Three P&IE team members, Team Leader/Performance Evaluation, Betsy Bassan, Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist, Brenda Sinclair, and Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator, Stella Neema will conduct the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation. All three have been associated with P&IE from the outset. In addition, the P&IE COP, Alicia Menendez, and NORC's home office P&IE director, Varuni Dayaratna, will provide ongoing oversight and support. Country-based support will be provided by NORC's Resident Evaluation Manager, Evelyn Namubiru, who will also participate in district and school site visits to expand the number of schools visited.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

A.   BACKGROUND

The **School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)** is a five-year USAID-funded cooperative agreement implemented by RTI International in collaboration with partners, SIL Lead (SIL) for reading improvement in local languages, World Education (WEI) in HIV/AIDS education, and the Center for Social Research Uganda (CSR) in the implementation of early grade reading assessment. The overall objective of the program "Increasing Literacy and Health Seeking Behaviors" mirrors USAID/Uganda's Health Development Objective 3, through achievement of sub-objectives 3.1.1 "Health-Seeking Behaviors Increased" and 3.1.1.1 "Improved Literacy". Underlying this is the overarching objective to support the Government of Uganda in developing, implementing, assessing, and bringing to scale a successful approach to reading instruction and to deliver MoES's stated goal of producing a Ugandan led "Literacy Policy." To this end, the program will build institutional capacity, support policy development, and help institutionalize the training, support structures, and policies necessary for sustainability. To achieve the stated objectives, the program has identified two key results: 1) Improved Early Grade Reading and Transition to English and 2) Improved HIV/AIDS Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices.

Over the life of the program, reading improvements will be directly supported in 3,300 schools by working through the established MoES systems to train Primary Teacher College (PTC) tutors, coordinating center tutors (CCTs), district and areas inspectors and head teachers to train and support teachers to effectively teach reading. The program aims to train over 12,000 teachers in early grade reading and provide effective reading instruction to approximately 1 million learners in P1-P4. Indirect beneficiaries from the scale up of the reading program through the MOES1 will add another 1.4 million learners to this total. Another important component of the program is supporting the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) to develop language boards, reading instructional materials and pupil primers in both English and 12 local languages – almost 2 million reading primers will be in the hands of learners by the end of the program. Under result 2, 8,000 teachers will be trained and 500,000 learners across nearly 1,700 primary schools, secondary schools and BTVET institutions reached through learning activities designed to help them understand and practice healthy behaviors aimed at preventing HIV/AIDS. In total, the program will work in 4,148 primary schools – 810 schools will have both result 1 and result 2 activities. The program will cover a total of 12 languages in 30 districts for result 1. Result 2 activities will take place in 17 districts (SHRP - PMP, Sept 2013)

The **Performance and Impact Evaluation** contract is a five-year effort implemented by prime contractor NORC and subcontractor Panagora Group. The primary purpose of the P&IE contract is to evaluate SHRP program implementation and effectiveness, and the extent to which the program's literacy and HIV/AIDS prevention activities result in measurable impact at the level of student learning. NORC leads the impact evaluation; and Panagora leads ongoing performance monitoring and feedback to the RTI program team, and the Mid-Term and Final Performance Evaluations. As a result, the performance evaluation team has the benefit of a great deal of knowledge and information which it is bringing into the performance evaluation process. Importantly, the impact evaluation, performance monitoring, and performance feedback effort is not co-located with RTI and has maintained its position as an independent and objective third party monitor.

As part of start-up of P&IE in October 2012, the P&IE team prepared a "Plan for Conducting the Performance Evaluations of Uganda SHRP," which was vetted with USAID and RTI. This allowed for significant advance planning of the performance evaluations and transparency in the evaluation process for the implementing partner, RTI, and its subcontractors.

B.   PURPOSE

The purpose of the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of SHRP is to assess effectiveness of activities to date using both qualitative and quantitative data and identify progress in achieving its planned five-year results against RTI's planned achievements for this stage of the work. As a mid-term evaluation, it will also provide recommendations to maintain or improve progress in achieving results.

- To assess program effectiveness, the Mid-Term Performance evaluation will:

- Assess the extent to which the program components are achieving stated goals and objectives per key program documents, i.e., cooperative agreement, results framework, work plans, Performance Management Plan (PMP), and reports

- Provide an understanding of progress by program rationale, impact, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability (engagement and ownership)

- Identify if there are management, coordination, and implementation practices that need to be maintained, stepped up, modified, or discontinued

- Consolidate lessons learned and best practices to promote scale up in this important and innovative area

- Examine the validity of SHRP's development hypotheses:

  - ► Result 1: By focusing interventions on the nexus of language, pedagogy, and instructional materials, USAID can significantly improve students' early grade reading and P3 literacy scores within targeted schools and districts.

  - ► Result 2: By strengthening cross-sector coordination between USAID's health and education partners, USAID can significantly improve teachers' and students' HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills within targeted schools and districts.

To assess **achievement of planned five-year SHRP results**, the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation will examine the degree to which the following program results and related outcomes have been achieved, to the extent it is possible to do so at this point in time:

1. National policy framework and Thematic Curriculum enhanced to strengthen the pedagogical framework early grade reading and transition to English

2. At least 3.5 million children demonstrating improved reading skills over the baseline levels for those grade levels

3. At least 10% of P2 students in target schools and districts demonstrating sufficient reading fluency and comprehension to 'read to learn'

4. 65% of students meeting Uganda's national literacy standards by P3 (NAPE)

5. 55% of students meeting Uganda's national literacy standards by P6 (NAPE)

6. Equity improved across genders, geographic regions and languages in early grade reading fluency, and in literacy at the P3 level (NAPE)

7. Language-based instructional materials developed for teachers and students to support the P1-P4 thematic curriculum and promote a reading culture

8. HIV/AIDS education assessment and reporting integrated into MOES systems

9. Cross-sector health and education coordination on HIV/AIDS and health strengthened at the national, district, and school levels

10. Improved HIV/AIDS and health knowledge demonstrated by teachers and students in target districts over the baseline levels for target group

In Annex C, we have grouped these as process and output results.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A.   PROPOSED APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

A.1   Use of Best Practices

The Mid-Term Performance evaluation is designed and will be implemented using best practices in evaluation, which includes:

- Using subject matter specialists in literacy and health

- Having the evaluation specialists participate in identifying questions for baseline data collection and the implementing team provide input on the PE methodology and questions (achieved during P&IE start-up in October 2012)

- Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative information

- Reinforcing local capacity by having local specialists on the performance evaluation team

- Being transparent in the evaluation design and dissemination of evaluation findings

A2.   Evaluation Design

This will be a cross-sectional descriptive and analytical performance evaluation employing qualitative methods of data collection. We will look at the program's inputs, processes and outputs. Though evaluation will employ mainly qualitative methods of data collection, we will gather quantitative data through review of documents. The data collection methodologies to be utilized include; a) desk review; b) key informant interviews (KIIs); classroom observation; and focus group discussions (FGDs). This is described in detail below. In Annex A, we present guides for key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and classroom observations.

Document review. Key documents that will be reviewed include: cooperative agreement, results framework, work plans, PMP, RTI/SHRP reports and strategies, RTI survey data and NORC/P&IE annual impact evaluation; SHRP EGR assessment reports; Uganda National Examination Board data on student performance; HIV/AIDS information; school level data, KAP survey reports, and any other documents that may be of value towards the conducting of the evaluation. Also important will be analysis of the tracking documents developed and compiled by the NORC/Panagora team throughout the program to date as part of Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) activities. These include third party monitoring data, monthly third party reports, and monthly performance feedback memos. The goal of the review is to obtain information to answer the key evaluation questions and to determine which evaluation questions would need detailed primary data collection and verification from the field.

Key Informant Interviews. KIIs will be conducted with different stakeholders at national, district school/community levels. They will include Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) commissioners overseeing Results 1 and 2; National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC); Directorate of Education Standards (DES); Teacher, Instructor Education and Training (TIET) Ministry of Gender Labor and Social Development (MoGLSD); USAID, and RTI implementing partners. In addition RTI/SHRP top and mid-level managers will be interviewed including the PIASCY trainers/facilitators and interns/field assistants. At district level key people to interview will include the District Education Officers (DEOs), District Inspector of Schools (DIS'), Principles of PTC, and CCTs. Annex B includes a preliminary contact list for key informant interviews.

These interviews will be conducted in order to assess how the program is contributing to the achievement of the goals, whether management of the program is functioning well, and to identify any challenges and/or bottlenecks.

Focus Group Discussions. FGDs will be conducted with school management committees and secondary school learners to assess the reach and effectiveness of the SHRP school level activities and to collect recommendations for improving their activities and the overall program design. Among the learner FGDs at the school level, we anticipate approximately 12 participants per group; and will work with each school to ensure gender, and age representation. We will follow standard Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval requirements, led by NORC. Criteria for schools selected for visits are aimed at having a mix of regions and languages, and rural/urban and high to low performing schools.

Classroom observations. Observations will be conducted in the classroom to examine the extent to which teachers are applying the reading methodologies learned during SRHP workshops. The team will also assess the conditions of the classroom, learner participation in reading activities, and the interaction between the teachers and learners, especially for Result 1.

A3.   Evaluation Questions

The key evaluation questions for the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation are:

- *Design.* Does the program design and structure adequately support and facilitate achievement of the desired results?

- *Implementation.* Has the program been implemented according to plan and on track to achieving its overall objectives and results?

- *Impact.* What are the key factors for differences in performance (reading skills acquisition and HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills) in schools receiving the same interventions?

- *Sustainability.* To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance?

- *Cost-effectiveness.* What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions? In what ways can the programs be more cost effective?

- *Management/Coordination/Lessons Learned.* How can program design, management and execution become more efficient toward achieving program goals?

Additional questions are included in the interview guide in Annex A. These will be tailored to each audience, whether central government officials, USAID, RTI, district officials, schools, or implementing partners. These questions closely track those included in the "Plan for Conducting the Performance Evaluations of Uganda SHRP," prepared by Panagora Group and vetted as part of P&IE start-up in October 2012 with USAID and RTI. The continued use of questions initially vetted with all parties helps ensure the transparency desired for the implementing partner, RTI, and its subcontractors in the evaluation process.

B.   DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS METHODS

B1.   Data Sources

The **sources of data** for the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation will include:

- Program documents

- Third party monitoring data, monthly third party reports, and monthly performance feedback memos
- Qualitative information via:
  - ► KIIs and FGDs with stakeholders, implementing partners, and beneficiaries
  - ► Classroom observation
- Quantitative data:
  - ► RTI survey data and NORC/P&IE annual impact evaluations
  - ► SHRP EGR assessments
  - ► Uganda National Examination Board data on student performance
  - ► AIDS indicator survey and other HIV/AIDS information

Individuals and groups to be interviewed include:

USAID

- Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for P&IE
- Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR) for SHRP
- Organizational Learning Advisor

National Level

- MoES staff involved in the program
- Commissioners, NCDC, HIV MOES Technical Working Group (TWG), and MEEPP

District level

- DEOs, Municipal Education Officers (MEOs), DIS', Municipal Inspectors of Schools (MIS'), local language boards (LLBs), teachers, Core PTCs, CCTs

School/community level

- Head teacher
- Teachers trained in R1 or R2
- Secondary school learners
- School Management Committees (parents, teachers, and community leaders)

RTI/SHRP

- COP, M&E Advisor
- Mid-level management (e.g., result team leaders)
- Result teams

The matrix below shows the target program district and the languages for the two result areas. We will select districts and the target schools to visit for the performance evaluation, to achieve a blend of

regions, new and traditional districts, rural and urban areas, local languages, and high-medium-low performing schools.

SHRP Program Districts (Bold = tentatively selected for site visit)

Cluster	Local Area language	Region	Districts	Result area
1	**Luganda**	**Central**	**Wakiso**, Gomba	Result 1 and 2
1	**Runyankore/Rukiga**	**South West**	Kiruhura, Bushenyi, **Kabale**	
1	Ateso	Eastern	Kumi, Katakwi, Serere	
1	**Leblango**	**Northern**	Apac, **Lira**, Kole	
2	Runyoro/Rutoro	Mid-Western	Masindi, Kyenjojo, Kabarole	
2	Acholi	Mid-Northern	Gulu, Pader, Kitgum	
2	Lugbarati	West Nile	Arua	Result 1 only
2	Lumasaba	Mid-Eastern	Mbale, Sironko, Manafwa	
3	Lugwere	Mid -Eastern	Budaka, Pallisa, Kibuku	
3	Ngakarimojong	North East	Nakapiripirit, Napak, Abim	
3	Lukhonzo	Mid-Eastern	Kasese	
3	Lusoga	East Central	Iganga and Kamuli	

Source: USAID/Uganda SHRP PMP. Version September 19, 2013

B2. Data Analysis

The data that will be analyzed for each evaluation question consist of:

Rationale

- Program Cooperative Agreement and Amendments
- Work Plans and Gantt Chart
- PMP
- Program reports: quarterly and annual reports, trip reports, ad hoc reports and presentations, meeting notes
- Ministry/USAID/Program Strategy Documents
- KIIs with RTI and its partners, USAID, US Embassy/PEPFAR Coordinator, and GoU including MoES, MoGLSD, NAPE DES, UNEB, NCDC, Kyambogo University, MEEPP, Coordinator, Language Boards

Implementation

- Program Monitoring Plan
- Monitoring data in quarterly and annual reports
- P&IE reports of observed SHRP events, monthly reports, and performance feedback memos (which include RTI comments following a monthly discussion)
- All KIIs and FGDs

Impact

- KIIs with selected GoU officials:

- ▶ MoES at national level
- ▶ Language Boards at the district and national level
- ▶ District Education Officer (DEO), district Inspector of Schools (DIS)
- ▶ School administrators (including head teachers), CCTs, and PTCs
- KIIs with USAID, RTI staff, and teachers in intervention districts
- FGDs with school management committees and secondary students in intervention districts

Sustainability

- Review of program documents
- All KIIs and FGDs
- Classroom observation and review of classroom instruction materials
- Review of policy documents and curricula
- P&IE survey data and annual impact evaluations
- SHRP EGR assessments

Cost-effectiveness

- Budget data
- All KIIs and FGDs
- P&IE survey data and annual impact evaluations
- SHRP EGR assessments

The documents, KIIs, FGDs, and site visits/observations will be analyzed to identify key themes in each of these areas and in particular in response to each of the evaluation questions. To the extent possible, data will be disaggregated by gender, age, geographic location, income level, and other important characteristics.

B3. Design and Methodology Limitations

The P&IE team recognizes the inherent limitations and challenges associated with collecting and analyzing information for a program that is both national and local in its scope. Fortunately, we have the benefit of collecting a large amount of information over a long period of time covering a great deal of the activities underway. We also have a strong understanding of the work, and will not have to spend a large amount of time simply orienting ourselves to the basic fundamentals of the program. Panagora and NORC are also taking advantage of the time in advance of the Mid-Term Performance evaluation to perform a deep analysis of the SHRP work plan and PMP against the progress as stated in the quarterly reports, which will additionally increase the foundation of our understanding and knowledge coming into the evaluation.

B4. Performance Evaluation Framework

The matrix below aggregates the areas for evaluation, the key and other evaluation questions in each area, and the data sources that will be used.

| | **Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Questions** | **Data Sources** | |
		Document Review	KIIs, FGDs, and/or Classroom Observation
Rationale	*Key question*: Does the program design and structure adequately support and facilitate achievement of the desired results? What is the defining rationale for the strategies and activities implemented under the Literacy and Health Education Program What priorities guide the program? How have they been identified? By whom? Have the program's strategic priorities been effectively translated into a clear, coherent, focused plan of support to the MOES, target districts and schools?	Cooperative Agreement and Amendments Work Plan and Gantt Chart PMP Program reports: quarterly and annual reports, trip reports, ad hoc reports and presentations, meeting notes Ministry/USAID/Program Strategy Documents	KII: • GoU including MoES, MoGLSD, NAPE DES, UNEB, NCDC, Kyambogo University, MEEPP, Coordinator, and LLBs • USAID and PEPFAR Coordinator • RTI and its partners
Implementation	*Key question*: Has the program been implemented according to plan and on track to achieving its overall objectives and results? Are the systems and mechanism for documenting lessons learned and best practices effective? How can program design, management and execution become more efficient toward achieving program goals? Is the program meeting its deliverables and targets for each result indicator?	PMP, monitoring data, program reports P&IE reports of observed SHRP events, monthly reports, and performance feedback memos (which include RTI comments following a monthly discussion)	• All KIIs and FGDs

	Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Questions	**Data Sources**	
		Document Review	KIIs, FGDs, and/or Classroom Observation
Impact	*Key question:* What are the key factors for differences in performance (reading skills acquisition and HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills) in schools receiving the same interventions? Rate how well each program component is contributing to the program and/or assistance objectives. Which interventions have the greatest effect on reading skills acquisition? Which have the least? Are some program components having better success in some schools (context) than others? What are the key factors for the differences in performance in some schools (contexts) receiving the same interventions? At what point (reading stage, grade) are students making the transition from learning to read to reading to learn?	PMP, monitoring data, program reports P&IE survey data and annual impact evaluations	KII: • GoU: DEO, DIS, LLB, head teachers, trained teachers, CCT, PTC • KIIs with USAID, RTI staff, and teachers in intervention districts • FGDs with school management committees and secondary school students in intervention districts
Sustainability	*Key question:* To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance? What is the sustainability plan? What are the factors contributing to sustainability? What level of engagement and ownership is demonstrated by the MOES and other stakeholders of the program? What are their perceptions of the program? To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance? How can components become more sustainable? What resources (e.g., instructional materials) have been produced? How have they been developed/distributed? With what result? Are they being used? What is the plan for continued availability?	Program documents Classroom instruction materials Policy documents and curricula P&IE survey data and annual impact evaluations SHRP EGRA	All KIIs and FGDs Classroom observation

	Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Questions	**Data Sources**	
		Document Review	KIIs, FGDs, and/or Classroom Observation
Cost-effectiveness	*Key question:* What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions? In what ways can the programs be more cost effective? What are the costs and impact associated with the strategic approaches, activities and "treatments"? What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions? In what ways can the programs be more cost effective? Are there costs that can be absorbed by the government, community, school budget, or private sector? Are there ways the reading books could be locally produced and distributed (if applicable)?	Budget data P&IE survey data and annual impact evaluations SHRP EGRA	All KIIs and FGDs

EVALUATION TASKS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TIMELINE

A.   TASKS

The key tasks include the following:

- Finalize tools including tailoring them to each audience
- Finalize schedule and logistics
- Plan Team Planning Meeting (TPM) for first day in-country
- Carry out desk review
- Carry out Kampala-based interviews
- Carry out site visits to regions/districts/schools
- Analyze information collected
- Develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- Prepare PowerPoint presentation summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations
- Vet PowerPoint presentation summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations with RTI and USAID
- Prepare final Mid-Term Evaluation report

B.   ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Staffing. The Mid-Term Performance Evaluation will be undertaken by staff provided by Panagora Group, specifically:

- Team Leader, Betsy Bassan
- Literacy/Education Specialist, Brenda Sinclair
- Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator, Stella Neema

NORC's COP, Alicia Menendez, and home office director, Varuni Dayaratna, will provide ongoing oversight and support; country-based support will be provided by NORC's Resident Evaluation Manager, Evelyn Namubiru, who will also participate in the field visits to schools to expand the number of site visits.

The team leader will be responsible for the overall quality and completeness of the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation, implementation of the performance evaluation work plan, and day-to-day supervision of the performance evaluation team, which will be managed in a collaborative manner. Via prior planning and communication to prepare for the performance evaluation, the TPM at the outset of the assignment in country, and continuing communication and meetings throughout the performance evaluation, the team leader will ensure clear understandings among team members on respective roles and responsibilities, the work plan, and the final product. The team leader will facilitate the TPM, ensuring data collection instruments are finalized, and that the schedule, logistics, and interview protocol (alternating responsibility for leading meetings and note-taking) are clearly set out and commonly understood. She will ensure that the evaluation team maintains its time schedule, including the timeline for data collection, analysis, report development, report vetting, and finalization.

The Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist will provide specialized expertise in all element of the

evaluation related to Result 1, including input on data collection instruments, the development of the data collection plan and its implementation, analysis of Result 1 related data, and development of findings, conclusions, and recommendations on early grade reading and education. The Senior HIV/AIDS Evaluator will play a similar role for Result 2. In addition, she will support the Team Leader in advance and in-country scheduling and logistics. Both specialists will fully participate in drafting the evaluation report and in supporting the team leader to finalize the report. The Resident Evaluation Manager will provide ongoing support to the performance evaluation team with scheduling, logistics, and participation in district visits.

C.   WORK PLAN TIMELINE AND OUTPUTS

SHRP Mid-Term Evaluation Activity and Outputs Timeline		
Timeline (Period, Location)	**Activity**	**Outcome**
Planning and preparation (2-3 days, virtual) Complete by June 9	• Desk review and document analysis • Determine KII and FGD list, and districts/school selection • Develop data collection instruments • Schedule all KIIs, FGDs, and site visits and complete all related logistics • Prepare detailed outline for Mid-Term PE • Team Leader and Literacy/Education Evaluation Specialist arrive in Kampala on Sunday, June 15; and join Ugandan Sr. HIV/AIDS Evaluator	Highly developed data collection instrument, PE implementation plan including design, schedule, logistics, etc.
Week 1 **June 16-21** **TPM and Kampala-based data collection**	• June 16: Team Planning Meeting (TPM) to finalize data collection instruments, clarify roles and responsibilities, review/confirm PE implementation plan including approach to ongoing analysis and writing Days 2-6: • Meeting and KII with USAID (0.5 day) • KII with US Embassy/PEPFAR Coordinator • KIIs with GoU (1 day) • KIIs with RTI (1.5 days) • KIIs with RTI partners/subcontractors, some by Skype (1 day) • Draft notes and analyze issues and themes (1 day) • Review, triangulate and tabulate data • Analyze qualitative and quantitative information and populate PE outline as possible	Final data collection instruments, and PE implementation plan
Week 2: **June 23-28** **District site visits and data collection** **2 days each:** - **Central: Gomba District** - **Southwest: Kabale District** - **North: Lira**	• Resident Evaluation Manager (REM) joins PE Team • June 22: All four PE team members travel to Gomba • June 23: KII district headquarters, visit urban school • June 24: Visit rural school • June 25: Team Leader and REM travel to Southwest, Kabale District; Literacy Specialist and HIV/AIDS Evaluator travel to North, Lira District • June 26: KII district headquarters, visit urban school • June 27: visit rural school • June 28: return to Kampala, debrief on district visits, possibly brief USAID on summary of preliminary findings and progress • Throughout:	Visit a total of six schools in mix of regions, types of districts, rural/urban, high/medium/low performing

SHRP Mid-Term Evaluation Activity and Outputs Timeline		
Timeline (Period, Location)	Activity	Outcome
District	o Review, triangulate and tabulate data o Analyze qualitative and quantitative information and populate PE outline as possible	

Week 3:
June 30 – July 4
Kampala
	• June 30 – July 2:
	  o Continue analysis and development of findings, conclusions, and recommendations; dedicated writing
	  o Develop PE report summary for vetting with RTI and USAID
	• July 3
	  o Vet PE report contents with RTI and then USAID
	• July 4
	  o Integrate feedback into final report
	  o Agree on plan to finalize remaining report elements
		Draft Mid-Term PE Report Summary

By October 15 **From consultant offices in U.S. and Uganda**	• Finalize Mid-Term PE Report • NORC submits Mid-Term PE to USAID on October 31	Mid-Term PE Report

D. KEY INFORMANTS AND FOCUS DISCUSSION GROUPS

We will collect information at the national level and at the district and school level, focusing on the entities and individuals cited below. An initial contact list is provided in Annex B.

D1. National Level Data Collection

The detailed list of KIIs and FGDs in Kampala by category of interviews and time allocated to each is as follows:

- Government – 1 day
  - ► MoES
  - ► NCDC
  - ► MEEPP– need to confirm
- USAID – COR for P&IE, COA for SHRP, and Organizational Learning Advisor – ½ day
- US Embassy/PEPFAR Coordinator
- RTI – 1.5 days
  - ► KII:
    - o COP
    - o M&E Advisor
    - o R1 Manager

          o   R2 Manager
          o   RTI district monitors
- ► FGD:
  - o R1 team as FGD
  - o R2 team as FGD

- RTI/SHARP NGO partners: 1 day
  - ► Center for Social Research/Kampala
  - ► World Education/Boston – Skype from Kampala
  - ► SIL LEAD/Nairobi– Skype from Kampala
  - ► Volunteer Services Organization (VSO Int'l)/Kampala

D2. District and School Level Data Collection

KIIs and FGDs at the district and school level will include:

- Districts: DEO, DIS, LLB, PTC, CCT- 2days
- Schools: 1 day per school, with an urban school in each district visited the same day as district interviews, and a rural school on the second day
  - ► MEO (municipal education officer)
  - ► Classroom observation
  - ► FGDs with :
    - School management committees
    - Secondary School learners
  - ► KIIs with Head Teacher and teachers trained by SHRP (R1 and R2)

E.   WORK PLAN OUTPUTS
The key outputs are the:

1. Final Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Implementation Work Plan, to be completed at the June 16 Team Planning Meeting (TPM) in Kampala

2. Draft Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Summary, to be provided at the July 3 meeting with RTI and then USAID

3. Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Report submitted to NORC on October 15 and NORC submits to USAID on October 31

STRUCTURE OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Following USAID's Evaluation Report Template (and its page allocations, where indicated), the structure of the SHRP Mid-Term Performance Evaluation Report will be as follows:

Cover (incorporating Marking and Branding Plan requirements)

Acknowledgements and cover photo caption from evaluation site visits

Title Page

TOC

Acronyms

Executive Summary (3-4 pp)

I.   Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions (1-2 pp)
II.   Program Background (1-3 pp)
III.   Evaluation Design, Methods and Limitations (1-3 pp with details in annex)
IV.   Findings and Conclusions (page length not prescribed; findings are typically 10-15 pages and conclusions 2-4 pages)
V.   Recommendations (page length not prescribed; typically 3-4 pages)

Annexes

Annex A: Evaluation Statement of work

Annex B: Evaluation Design, Methods, and Limitations (add'l detail than in body of report)

Annex C: Data Collection Instruments (questionnaires)

Annex D: Sources of Information (documents reviewed, sites visited, key informants, FGD (type and number participants)

Annex E: Disclosures (if any)

Annex F: Other information

PLAN FOR VALIDATION AND DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

A.　　VETTING AND VALIDATION OF MID-TERM EVALUATION PLAN

During start of P&IE in October 2012, Panagora vetted a "Plan for Conducting the Performance Evaluations of Uganda SHRP," with USAID and with RTI. Panagora has maintained communication with RTI on evaluation timing, interviews, and site visits. At the outset of the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation, the evaluation team will meet with USAID and RTI staff, be available for debriefs during the course of the evaluation as appropriate, and include meetings at the end of the evaluation for vetting and validating findings, conclusions, and recommendations with RTI and with USAID. Through the P&IE third party monitoring and performance feedback, we have established a routine of communicating feedback to RTI in a constructive and appreciative manner that will serve us well in the context of the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation.

B.　　DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

We recognize the significance of the P&IE as a pioneering effort to implement USAID's relatively new Evaluation Policy and SHRP as an innovative and cross-disciplinary effort. We look forward to implementing the Dissemination Workshop scheduled for xxx and to sharing lessons learned and best practices within Uganda. We will discuss with USAID/Uganda other avenues for sharing these with the broader international development community, whether through a presentation at USAID/W, or an event with the Society for International Development or another relevant professional association.

In addition, the Mid-Term Performance Evaluation report will be made available in digital form in the through the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse website (dec.usaid.gov) so that it is can be accessed publicly.

ANNEX A. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

A1. KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of

USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)

INTERVIEW GUIDE

NOTE: THIS INTERVIEW GUIDE WILL BE TAILORED TO EACH AUDIENCE: USG, GOU (CENTRAL AND DISTRICT LEVELS), RTI, IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS, AND TEACHERS (HEAD AND SHRP TRAINED TEACHERS)

Interviewee:

☐ U.S. Government (USAID, PEPFAR Coordinator)

☐ Government of Uganda officials

☐ MoES (R1 Manager, R2 Manger, HIV/AIDS TWG)

☐ District/Municipal Education Office (DEO/MEO, DIS, LLB, PTC, CCT)

☐ RTI (COP, M&E Advisor, R1 Manager, R2 Manager)

☐ RTI partners (World Education, SIL Lead, VSO, CSR)

☐ Head teacher, R1 and R2 trained teachers

Name:	Address:
Title:	Telephone:
Organization:	Email: Fax: (**Note:** complete if no business card provided)
Interviewer(s): Date of interview: Location of interview:	

I. Introduction

Introduce the Performance Evaluation and interviewers and explain that you have some pre-set questions to ask. Request consent to participate in the evaluation and emphasize confidentiality. Ask participants for a description of their role/responsibilities and interface with SHRP.

II. Interview Questions

These questions will be adapted for different audiences.

A. Rationale

Key question: Does the program design and structure adequately support and facilitate achievement of the desired results?

What is the defining rationale for the strategies and activities implemented under the Literacy and Health Education Program?

What are the goals and objectives of the School Health and Reading Program?

What priorities guided the design of the program? How were they identified? By whom?

Does the program design and structure adequately support and facilitate achievement of the desired results?

Have the program's strategic priorities been effectively translated into a clear, coherent, focused plan of support to the MOES, target districts and schools? Or:

Is there a clear, coherent and focused work plan in place to support the MOES, target districts and schools with the program implementation and collaboration?

B. Implementation

Key question: Has the program been implemented according to plan and on track to achieving its overall objectives and results?

Are there systems and mechanisms in place for monitoring program performance, including lessons learned and best practices? Is it effective?

What issues, problems or setbacks have been encountered, and how have they been addressed? What issues/problems are still to be addressed?

What materials/resources (e.g., instructional materials) have been produced by the program? How have they been developed/distributed and with whom? Are they being used as intended to achieve program results? What are the plans for continued use after the program ends?

C. Impact

Key question: What are the key factors for differences in performance (reading skills acquisition and HIV/AIDS knowledge and skills) in schools receiving the same interventions?

What key accomplishments has the program achieved to date?

Rate how well each program component is contributing to the program results and/or assistance objectives (very well, well, somewhat well, not well, not at all).

Which interventions have the greatest effect on reading skills acquisition? Which have the least?

Are some program components having better success in some schools (context) than others?

Which districts/regions are demonstrating the greatest achievements? What are the key factors for the differences in performance in some schools/contexts receiving the same interventions?

Has there been any improvement in reading achievement to date as a result of the SHRP? If yes, to what extent?

What percentage of P1-P3 students is demonstrating improvements in achieving literacy benchmarks?

What are the lessons learned/best practices of the program thus far?

How can the program leverage best practices of the program?

D. Sustainability

Key question: To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance?

Is there a sustainability plan in place? What factors could (positively or negatively) affect sustainability?

What level of engagement and ownership is demonstrated by the MOES and other stakeholders of the program? What are their perceptions of the program?

What mechanisms are in place to promote engagement and ownership of the MOES in the program activities?

To what extent is the MOES involved in program implementation (e.g., developing materials, procurement, communication dissemination, etc.)?

To what extent will the programs components and subcomponents continue without USAID assistance?

Does the MOE have funding and capacity necessary for sustaining program activities? If not, what is required?

How can components become more sustainable?

Has the MOES and/or any other partners contributed to the funding and implementation of this program?

E. Cost-effectiveness

Key question: What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions?

In what ways can the programs be more cost-effective?

Are the resources available sufficient to achieve program objectives?

What strategies has the program applied to ensure cost-effectiveness, if any? In what ways can the program be more cost effective?

Is the program scalable? What are the implications and recommendations for potential scale-up of program interventions?

Are there costs that can be absorbed by the government, community, school budget, or private sector?

Are there ways the reading books could be locally produced and distributed (if applicable)?

F. Management/ Coordination/Lessons Learned

Key question: How can program design, management and execution become more efficient toward achieving program goals?

Has program management been efficient and effective?

How can program management and execution become more efficient toward achieving program goals?

What success has there been in building synergies and leveraging comparative advantages of different partners?

What opportunities are there to further strengthen the program?

A2. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of

USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FGD) GUIDE

NOTE:

We will further tailor this FGD guide for each of the two groups, (1) School Management Committees and (2) Secondary School Learners (we are seeking IRB approval via NORC). We anticipate FGDs will be conducted/facilitated in local languages (Luo, Luganda, and Rukiga), have translation for expatriate team members, and record the discussion so we are able to extract themes and findings.

Date of focus group:	Venue of focus group:
District:	Municipality:
Facilitator:	Documenter:
Translator:	Total number of participants:_____ Female: _____ Male: _____
Time start: _____Time end: _____Duration: _____	

Introduction

Purpose: Explain we are part of team evaluating a USAID-funded activity supporting school health and reading, and here to learn about accomplishments of the program to date and any recommendations for improvement. The purpose is for us to hear their views. Ask their consent to participate in the study and emphasize confidentiality. We will move the discussion along in order to fit in all our questions.

Introductions: Ask each participant to briefly introduce themselves:

- School Management Committee: name and role/title
- FGD with learners: age and grade

Questions

1. Are you familiar with the SHRP program? If yes, in which program trainings or activities have you participated?

2. What did you learn/do during the activity? Is there anything that you are doing differently as a result of the training/meetings/activity?

3. Which activities have had the greatest impact on reading? Which have had the most impact on health/HIV? Why?

4. Has there been any improvement in early grade reading/literacy as a result of the SHRP? Has there been any improvement in student health awareness, knowledge of HIV and prevention, and stigma reduction at school?

5. What did you like? What did you not like? Why?

6. What specific activities could be improved? How?

7. Are there any challenges that are interfering with children attending school or learning well while they are in school?

8. Do you have any recommendations for how to improve the program?

A3. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDE
Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of
USAID/Uganda School Health and Reading Program (SHRP)
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

District:_____
:_____and title of
Observer:_____
Date of Observation
Visit:_____

	Teacher Identification Information *(complete this before the lesson begins with information from the head teacher and/or teacher)*
1.	Grade level of class to be observed: a. ☐ P1 : b. ☐ P2 : c. ☐ P3 : d. ☐ P4
2.	Subject of class to be observed: a. ☐ Reading (literacy 1) b. ☐ writing (literacy 2) c. ☐ English d.☐ oral literature
3.	# of learners registered in Class: Total _____ 5. Boys_____ 6. Girls_____
4.	Local language school uses for instruction in P1-P3: a. ☐ Ateso b. ☐ Luganda c. ☐ Runyankore/Rukiga d. ☐ Leblango e. ☐ English f. ☐ Other_____ (specify)

	Classroom Environment *(Complete this section based on your own observation before teacher begins lesson.)*
5.	The room/space has a blackboard/chalkboard and the teacher has chalk. a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No
6.	The teacher has access to all learners (can walk through the rows of desks). a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No
7.	Fewer than half of the learners have seats: **A** ☐ **OR** More than half have seats b. ☐ **OR** ALL Have Seats c. ☐ Notes:
8.	Student work is displayed in the room/space or on the walls. a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No c. ☐ Not applicable (or no walls) Notes:
9.	Ventilation/lighting a. ☐ Poor: b. ☐ Good : c. ☐ No light Other:

Lesson Observation: Literacy 1 (reading)

Class Start-up (*tick "observed" only once as the action first occurs. At end of observation, tick actions that were not observed*)			
lesson starts: _____:____ (hr:min)	lesson ends: _____:____ (hr:min) _____minutes	**length of lesson**	
		Observed	**Not observed**
Instructional Content: Teacher guides learners to….			
9.	Read printed material or book		
Teaching Learning Material Use: Teacher uses…			
10.	Blackboard/Chalkboard		
11.	Textbook		
12.	Supplementary reading materials		
13.	Work sheets		
14.	Poster/wall charts (with letters, words, pictures)		
15.	Flash cards		
16.	Student exercise books and/or slates		
17.	Manipulatives (e.g. real objects, bottle caps, clay, sand, cut out words, etc.)		
Student Activities			
18.	Reading in groups/whole class		
19.	Reading individually		
20.	Answering questions		
21.	Selecting books		
22.	Drawing/writing/sketching		
23.	Talking/not paying attention		
24.	Girls and boys were ……(*tick all that apply*) a. ☐asked questions equally (proportionate to their numbers). b. ☐ given equal chances to answer questions		
25.	Teacher taught lesson in local language: a.☐All the time b. ☐ some of time c.☐ Not at all		

Please provide any other observations about the lesson or class? (Is the classroom engaging with relevant materials displayed on the walls? How much time was spent on reading specific activities)? If useful, you can even draw what the teacher has written on the board.

The following questions are asked/answered at the end of the lesson:

1.	Number of learners attending class: a. total_____ b. boys _____ c. girls_____
	For Question 2 and 3, ask teacher to show book.
2.	Teacher has his/her own textbook, teachers' guide applicable to this class. a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No
3.	The language of the textbook or guide is a.☐ local language being used by teacher b. ☐ English c. ☐other language
	For Questions 4-7 ask children to hold up book, exercise book/paper/slate, and pencil for the lesson. Count.
4.	How many learners have textbook or printed material? a. ☐ All b. ☐ Half or more than half c. ☐Less than half d. ☐ None
5.	*The language of the textbook or manual is* a. ☐local language being used by teacher b.☐English c.☐other language
6.	How many learners have an exercise book? a. ☐ All b.☐ Half or more than half c. ☐Less than half d. ☐ None
	For questions 7-8 randomly select 3 exercise books (from learners or a stack if they are all in one place).
7.	What is the date of the last assignment? Notes:
8.	Has the teacher marked them in the last week? Notes:
9.	How many learners have pencil or pen? a. ☐ All b. ☐ Half or more than half c. ☐Less than half d. ☐ None
10.	There are other books (other than textbook) accessible for children to read in the space? a. ☐ none b. ☐ less than 20 books c.☐ more than 20
	For Question 11-14, ask to see the teacher's lesson plan for the lesson just taught.
11.	Which lesson is the teacher teaching (corresponding to the teachers' guide)?
12.	Lesson follows the thematic curriculum (includes theme and theme corresponds to school term). a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No Explain:
13.	Lesson includes aspects of appropriate reading methodology and follows the teaching reading guide a. ☐ Yes b. ☐ No Explain:
14.	Teacher taught the lesson as indicated in the lesson plan a. ☐Yes b. ☐Partly c. ☐Not at all d. ☐No lesson plan
	For questions 15 ask teacher to see continuous assessment/or assessment marks
15.	Does it appear that the teacher keeps regular marks to track learner performance in reading/writing?

Notes: Are there any other constraints affecting teaching and learning of reading?

ANNEX B: PRELIMINARY CONTACT LIST

Category	Key Informant's Name and Organization	Number of People
Central Government	Ministry of Gender labor and Social Development (children and youth commissioner)	
	Martin Omagor, (program coordinator) Special Needs Education Danial Nkaada, (Result 1 component manager) Basic Education George Opiro, (Result 2 component manager) Guidance and Counselling Dr. Yusuf Nsubuga, Director of Basic and Secondary Ed (oversees HIV and AIDS in MoES) Mr. Roland Biryahwaho, MoES HIV unit Sarah Ayesiga, Directorate of Education Standards (DES) National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC): Connie Kateeba/Angela Kyagaba/ Deborah Magera/ Sarah Natunga Mutazindwa H.A., Directorate of Education Standards (DES) Margaret Nsereko. Teacher, Instructor Education and Training (TIET)	11
USG	USAID Joseph Mwangi, COR P&IE Mariella Ruiz-Rodriguez, COR SHRP Lane Pollack, Organizational Learning Advisor	3
	US Embassy PEPFAR Coordinator	1
Implementing Partner-RTI	Saeda Prew, COP Derek Nkata, Deputy COP Tracy Brunette, Apolot Florence/Moses Bagendera - M&E Robina Kyeyune, Result 1 Manager Schola Tigeryera, R2 Sarah Kyobe, Result 2 Manager Nelson Balyeku, Result 2	9
	Lead PIASCY Trainers Juliana Nyombi, Jane Nabalozi	2

Implementing Partner's Subcontractors	Shirley Birchfield, World Education Susan Mubala (Kampala)/Paul Frank (US) SIL LEAD Wilson Asiimwe, Center for Social Research Peter Barnard/Veronica Stapleton (SNE VSO Tom Evans, African Development Corps Loucine Hayes (director), Peace Corps	6
	Dr Fred Kisseka/Stephen Kiirya, DRASPAC (KAPS technical assistance)	2
District Level (for the 3 districts)		
District Education Office	District Education Officer (DEO) District Inspector of schools (DIS)	2
	Local language Board (LLB)	1
	Principle/Deputy Principle PTC CCT	2
	Field assistants (RTI)	3

ANNEX C: DATA SOURCES FOR SHRP PROCESS AND OUTCOME RESULTS

SHRP Program Five-Year Results	Data Sources	
	Document Review	KIIs and FGDs*
Process Results		
National policy framework and Thematic Curriculum enhanced to strengthen the pedagogical framework early grade reading and transition to English (#1)	National policy framework Thematic Curriculum	MOES (NCDC, R1 Mgr) USAID RTI
Language-based, instructional materials developed for teachers and students to support the P1-P4 thematic curriculum and promote a reading culture (#7)	Instructional materials, and printing and distribution records	MOES (NCDC, R1 Mgr) RTI LLBs Head teachers
HIV/AIDS education assessment and reporting integrated into MOES systems (#8)	District reports for the national EMIS Guideline on district protocol for data entry	MOES (R1 and R2 Mgr, HIV/AIDS TWG) RTI
Cross-sector health and education coordination on HIV/AIDS and health strengthened at the national, district, and school levels (#9)	Coordination meeting notes; GoU and RTI planning and budget document references	MOES (R1 and R2 Mgr, HIV/AIDS TWG) RTI (M&E)
Outcome Results		
At least 3.5 million children demonstrating improved reading skills over the baseline levels for those grade levels (#2)	RTI reports on number of children reached, impact evaluation, EGRA data	
65% or more of students meeting Uganda's national literacy standards by P3 as defined by NAPE (#4) 55% or more students meeting Uganda's national literacy standards by P6 as defined by NAPE (# 5)	P3 National Literacy Exam Scores P6 National Literacy Exam Scores	Note: PE will not address these as treatment group hasn't reached P3 level and will not reach P6 by program end

SHRP Program Five-Year Results	Data Sources	
	Document Review	KIIs and FGDs*
Equity improved across genders, geographic regions, and languages in early grade reading fluency, and in literacy at the P3 level (NAPE) (#6)	P3 National Literacy Exam Scores disaggregated by gender, region, and language (NAPE)	MOES (R1 Mgr, Basic and Secondary Education Director) RTI
At least 10% of P2 students in target schools and districts demonstrating sufficient reading fluency and comprehension to "read to learn" (#3)	Impact evaluation results EGRA Scores on comprehension exercise	MOES (R1 Mgr) RTI Note: we will not yet be able to assess this with the mid-term PE
Improved HIV/AIDS and health knowledge demonstrated by teachers and students in target districts over the baseline levels for target group (#10)	Impact evaluation results Comparison of HIV/AIDS and health knowledge baseline, mid-term, and final scores	MOES (R2 Mgr) RTI Teachers FGD: School health management committees and secondary school learners

*All KIIs except where FGD noted.